

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

No. 24-1545

Filed: March 19, 2025

ENAMUL HAQE CHOWDHURY,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE UNITED STATES,

Defendant.

ORDER

On September 30, 2024, plaintiff, Enamul Chowdhury, proceeding *pro se*, filed a complaint in this Court in which he appears to allege that the United States government failed to assist him in paying a court filing fee, and that the government of Bangladesh interfered with his ability to receive the proceeds of a judgment entered by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. *See generally* Plaintiff’s Complaint, ECF No. 1. Defendant filed its motion to dismiss on November 5, 2024. *See generally* Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss, ECF No. 8. Mr. Chowdhury’s response was due on or before December 3, 2024. *Id.* However, Mr. Chowdhury filed his response on March 17, 2025. *See generally* Plaintiff’s Response to Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss [hereinafter Plaintiff’s Motion]. Mr. Chowdhury’s response is therefore over three months late.

Rule 41(b) of the Rules of the United States Court of Federal Claims states that, “[i]f the plaintiff fails to prosecute or to comply with . . . a court order, the court may dismiss [the case] on its own motion,” and that doing so “operates as an adjudication on the merits.” Mr. Chowdhury failed to prosecute his case and failed to comply with a Court-ordered deadline by not filing his response by December 3, 2024. Plaintiff’s Motion is hereby **DISMISSED**, *sua sponte*, pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Rules of the United States Court of Federal Claims. The Clerk of Court is directed to take the necessary steps to dismiss this matter.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ *Loren A. Smith*

Loren A. Smith,
Senior Judge